DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 301 SP 025 579

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Testimony Presented at an Open Hearing of the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education (Atlanta, Georgia, October 15-16, 1984). |
| SPONS AGENCY | National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education (ED), Washington, DC. |
| PUB DATE | Oct 84 |
| NOTE | 15p.; For related documents, see SP 025 564-595. |
| PUB TYPE | Collected Works - General (020) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); *Government Role; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *State Government; *Teaching (Occupation) |
| IDENTIFIERS | National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Educ |

ABSTRACT

The following papers were presented as testimony to the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education open hearing: (1) "Effective In-Service Training" (Harold Finkelstein); and (2) "The State's Responsibilities for Teacher Education: Some Views" (Edward M. Wolpert). The first paper discusses the current state of teaching, namely: (1) that students are not interested, challenged, or knowledgeable--they are not learning, and (2) that teachers are using outdated methods and are not able to compete for their students' attention--they are not effective. An in-service training model designed to improve classroom instruction and student learning is described and recommendations are made regarding incorporation of the model's components in pre-service training programs. The second paper presents some ideas about how states and teacher educators can work together: (1) State Departments of Education need to work closely with schools, colleges, departments of education (SCDE); (2) States must help SCDEs attract better students to teacher education programs; and (3) States need to reconceptualize what teaching and teacher education are all about. (CB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED250301

# TESTIMONY PRESENTED AT AN OPEN HEARING OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION (Atlanta, Georgia, October 15-16, 1984)

National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, Washington, DC.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 025 579

Effective In-service Training

testimony
presented
to

The National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education

by

Dr. Harold Finkelstein
President

Discovery Learning, Inc.
1776 Peachtree St. NW
Suite 620 North
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
(404) 881-8200

October 16, 1984

The mission of Discovery Learning, Inc. (DLI), a non-profit organization begun in 1977, is to help improve classroom instruction and student learning. DLI conducts teacher in-service training nationwide and administers after-school and summer classes for children and youth in metropolitan Atlanta.

DLI receives contract and grant support for its programs from the National Science Foundation, from county and city governments, from individual schools and school systems, and from community foundations, corporations and individuals.

The target group of all DLI programs is educationally disadvantaged minority populations. DLI has consulted with elementary and secondary schools and colleges in 37 states, focusing mainly on large cities, rural areas and Indian reservations.

After 20 years of teaching, my recent observations are that:

a) students are not learning - they are:
   - not interested
   - not challenged
   - not knowledgeable;

b) teachers are not effective - they are:
   - using outdated methods
   - not able to compete for their students' attention

SP 025 579

Learning patterns and learning styles are changing rapidly in our society. The methods that most of us were taught by are no longer effective for a large and growing segment of our population. However, there are new and innovative approaches to teaching which need to be disseminated to all teachers. DLI has developed one of these approaches.

The DLI in-service program has two foci:

1) REACHING all students - full participation at all times in full-class settings;

2) TEACHING all students - using interactive dialogue.

The three-part DLI methodology:

A) Presentation methods and techniques to generate and maintain full participation;

B) Question/answer teaching delivery to create a true interactive experience;

C) Recasting existing curriculum content in support of new techniques and delivery.

The key elements of the DLI in-service model :

1) It is conducted in a school setting (either simulated or real) rather than in a university setting.

2) Desired outcomes are elicited from teachers, not imposed upon them. This provides ownership.

3) Techniques to effect these outcomes are demonstrated by the Discovery Learning trainers using students typical of those in participants' classrooms.

4) Teachers practice these techniques with the same students while the trainer observes and critiques.

DLI in-service programs follow a simple progression:

a) demonstration classes at a school - in one classroom with many teacher observers or many classrooms, each with a few observers;

b) critique and analysis of the approach methods and implications for the students and the teachers;

c) intensive in-class and outside-of-class training for those faculty who need and who want the program. The training consists of lesson preparation, practice teaching and follow-up. The length of training varies from one week to several months. THIS TRAINING SHOULD BE CONDUCTED DURING THE SCHOOL DAY AS IS ON-THE-JOB TRAINING IN ANY PROFESSION.

d) content reinforcement and enhancement to help teachers improve their instruction of concepts they have not yet mastered.

Special features may include:

- teaching the subject matter using the same methods that are expected of the teachers when they teach their own students;
- reaching all of the teachers in a school in some manner;
- peer presentations, observations, and critiquing using a class of students;
- demonstration/observation, peer presentations, peer critiquing using a class of cooperating students (on a topic familiar to the presenter), supplemented with reference material for teachers.

Several factors are crucial to successful training:

1) Having LEA collaboration: endorsement, invitation, support, use of their space and time;
2) Using volunteer teachers: stressing delivery rather than curriculum, proving it will work in their own classes, observing them teach;
3) Providing live training, rather than only tapes and books; and lastly, but most importantly,
4) Providing follow-up.

The DLI Process of Instruction meets all of these criteria.

I propose to this Commission that as a result of the successes and intense interest in the DLI program throughout the country,

1) a careful and thorough analysis of this program and other effective in-service models be undertaken;
2) elements of the DLI program be incorporated in pre-service training programs.

CONSULTING SUMMARY
FOR
DISCOVERY LEARNING, INC.

| LOCATION | SITE |
|---|---|
| Roanoke, VA | Southwest Virginia Community Fund |
| New York, NY | Cities In Schools, Inc. |
| Paterson, NJ | Urban Teacher Center |
| Passaic, NJ | Teacher Corps Kean College |
| Princeton, NJ | Pre Test Review, Inc. |
| Dallas, TX | Bishop College; Dallas Public Schools |
| Billings, MT | Montana Indian Education Conferences Office of Public Instruction |
| Houston, TX | Cities In Schools, Inc. |
| Philadelphia, PA | Temple University; Philadelphia School District |
| Prairie View, TX | Prairie View State College |
| Las Vegas, NM | New Mexico Highlands University; Las Vegas Public Schools |
| Santa Domingo, NM | Santa Domingo Public School |
| Cochiti, NM | Cochiti Public School |
| Robeson County, NC | Robeson County Schools |
| Lumberton, NC | Health Careers Program |
| Pine Ridge Res., SD | Loneman School |
| Rosebud Res., SD | St. Francis Indian School |
| Sells, AZ | Indian Oasis Schools |
| Oakland, CA | Cities In Schools, Inc. |
| St. Simons, GA | Cities In Schools, Inc. |
| Eufaula, AL | Cities In Schools, Inc. |
| Conyers, GA | Cities In Schools, Inc. |
| Charlotte, NC | Charlotte/Mecklinburg Public Schools |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| | |
|---|---|
| Oxford, GA | Papago Early Childhood Education |
| Ten Cities in Georgia | Georgia Association of Educators |
| Queenstown, MD | Aspen Institute |
| Cibecue, AZ | Cibecue Day School |
| Navajo Nation | Navajo Reservation Schools |
| Tsaile, AZ | Navajo Community College |
| Vernal, UT | National Indian Adult Education Association |
| Rapid City, SD | South Dakota Indian Education Association |
| Spokane, WA | N.W. Regional Mathematics Conference |
| Lodge Grass, MT | Lodge Grass School |
| Ashland, MT | St. Labra Indian School |
| Browning, MT | Blackfeet Community College |
| Rocky Boy, MT | Rocky Boy Schools |
| Ft. Belknap, MT | Adult Education |
| Rapid City, SD | University of North Dakota |
| Philadelphia, PA | Math Curriculum Committee Meeting; Philadelphia Public Schools |
| Fort Apache, AZ | Theodore Roosevelt Boarding School |
| Cedar Creek, AR | John F. Kennedy Elementary School |
| St. Louis, MO | The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development |
| Port Townsend, WA | State of Washington Office of Public Instruction Teacher Aides Workshop |
| Pearl River, NY | Pearl River School District |
| Globe, AZ | Globe Public Schools |
| Holbrook, AZ | Superintendents Association |
| Whiteriver, AZ | Whiteriver Public Schools; Lutheran Mission School |
| Atlanta, GA | Georgia Association of Educators State Convention |
| Ft. Benning | Loyd Elementary School |
| Kennesaw, GA | Kennesaw College |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| | |
|---|---|
| Muskogee, OK | Bacone College |
| Lawrence, KS | Haskell College |
| Busby, MT | Busby School |
| Rock Point, AZ | Rock Point Community School |
| Zuni, NM | Dowa Yalanne Elementary; Zuni Elementary; Zuni High School |
| Bozeman, MT | Montana State University; Montana Bilingual Education Association Conference |
| Laguna, NM | Laguna Elementary |
| Flagstaff, AZ | Northern Arizona University |
| Portland, OR | National Indian Education Association Conference |
| Ketchikan, AK | Ketchikan, Indian Corporation Indian Education Workshop |
| Phoenix, AZ | Phoenix Indian High School |
| Phoenix, AZ | Murphy School District |
| Tuskegee Institute, AL | Tuskegee Institute |
| San Carlos, AZ | Rice Elementary School |
| Atlanta, GA | SECME |
| Philadelphia, PA | PRIME |
| Marietta, GA | Cobb County Teacher Aides Workshop |
| Atlanta, GA | IBM Employment Training Center Workshop |
| Dulce, NM | Dulce Independent School |
| Edmonds, WA | Edmonds School District |
| Taos, NM | Taos Pueblo Day School |
| Acoma, NM | Sky City Community School |
| Dzilthnaodithhle, AZ | Dzilthnaodithhle School |
| New York, NY | NACME |
| Seattle, WA | Cedar Way School |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# THE STATE'S RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION: SOME VIEWS

by
Dr. Edward M. Wolpert
Dean, School of Education
Georgia College
Milledgeville, Georgia 31061

A paper presented to the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education

Atlanta, Georgia
October 15, 1984

I am happy to have the opportunity to address the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education today. I believe that war is too important to be left to the generals, medicine is too important to be left to the doctors, and similarly, education is too important to be left to the educators. Thus I come to you not only as a Dean of the School of Education of Georgia College but also as a parent and citizen. All three roles influence my thinking.

The gist of my remarks today is quite simple. The State has a responsibility for teacher education, and we as teacher educators share that responsibility. There are issues to be addressed and improvements to be made. Teacher educators can't do it alone; we are all in this together. And what I would like to do today is to share some thoughts with you on how states and teacher educators can work together.

1. State Departments of Education need to work closely with Schools, Colleges, Departments of Education (SCDEs).

Let me say at the outset that I believe that the approved program model by which SCDEs have their programs evaluated by State Departments of Education is a good model, and the locus of control is appropriate. The idea of States, through their Departments of Education, developing criteria, inspecting programs, evaluating and approving or denying approval is excellent and the model should be rigorously and uniformly applied. But I do believe the process can be improved in three ways.

First, the State Department can help by having levels of approval. As it stands now, the typical model for State Departments of Education is to consider a program submitted by SCDEs, and either approve or not approve it. From the point of view of the SCDE there is only one thing

to seek and that is approval. I would like State Departments of Education to consider the idea of having additional levels of approval. Perhaps a program could be rated "Exemplary" or perhaps there could be "Level I or Level II" approval. The effect that this would have would be to keep a safety net at the bottom of the approval process to make sure that any program that was approved did, indeed, meet minimum requirements, but in addition it would encourage SCDEs to aim higher, that is, to develop programs that exceed the minimum standards promulgated by the State Departments of Education. This would encourage SCDEs to be creative in their efforts and would allow for the development of innovative programs which otherwise might not come to pass.

Secondly, I believe State Departments of Education can help by not being overly restrictive in their minimum standards. For example, often requirements for programs are stated in terms of specific courses carrying specific numbers of credit hours (e.g. five quarter hours for a curriculum course, or three semester hours for a course in reading methods). It would be much more desirable for State Departments of Education to state standards in terms of competencies, that is to say, knowledge to be acquired or behaviors to be exhibited. My reason for this is simple. SCDEs are subject to the same laws of arithmetic to which everyone else is subjected, and when the State Departments of Education specify that there must be taken five hours in one course and five hours in another course this builds up rapidly to the point where all of the possible hours available for the program have been preempted. This results in programs needing to go beyond a traditional four year time frame. Additionally, there remains virtually no room for electives in a

program. Neither of these results is a desirable one. SCDEs cannot utilize effectively the time available in programs when they are overly restricted by State promulgated criteria.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, State Departments of Education need to put a severe restriction on the issuance of substandard credentials. In the state of Georgia for example, the number of teachers certified with substandard credentials greatly exceeds those certified with regular credentials. The standards that are published by State Departments of Education have no meaning if they are constantly undercut. Furthermore, circumventing published standards makes a mockery of the whole concept of approved programs. In the end, we all look bad--SCDEs as well as State Departments of Education--and the public interest is poorly served.

2. The states must help SCDEs attract better students to teacher education programs.

This is the real key to having better teachers. From the point of view of an SCDE, we must be judged in terms of a value added model. Students come to us with certain levels of skills and abilities. We take those students and we add to their skills and abilities and we may be judged on the basis of the difference between how they were when they came to us and how they are when they leave us. The problem is when the students themselves come to us with very low levels of skills or abilities. Even though we can add some value, the absolute amount of value may not be enough to meet the high standard needed for effective entry level teaching. Input begets output. The better the students we have at the outset, the better the beginning teachers we will produce.

We simply must attract better students to teaching if we are to produce better beginning teachers. The first way to do this is obvious: teacher's salaries must be made more attractive. If the starting salaries for teachers were raised to the point where they would be competitive with other professions whose training involved programs of similar length and difficulty, more students would be attracted to teaching. There has been so much written about this already (e.g. the Rand report[1]) more need not be said.

The second way better students can be attracted is to have a Career Ladder[2] in effect, because even if beginning salaries were raised to be comparable with other professions a real need exists for teachers to be still making comparable salaries after they have been teaching for ten, fifteen, twenty, or thirty years. In other words, money is needed not only to get teachers in the classroom but to keep them in the classroom.

An added attraction to the concept of Career Ladder is that I believe it will reattract qualified women into the teaching work force. The current generation of women is entering many other fields as of course they should have the opportunity to do. However, many of these women are of child-bearing age and wish to indeed have children while they can. This has been a perennial problem with women in the work force but it is now exacerbated by the fact that women are going into professions where typically previously they had not gone. Women are finding that it is very difficult to leave jobs in the corporate world in order to raise children and then return at the level they were at when they left.

---

1. Darling-Hammond, Linda, Beyond the Commission Reports, The Coming Crises in Teaching, Santa Monica, California, The Rand Corporation, 1984.

2. The Tennessee Career Ladder plan is an excellent model to consider from among a variety of plans.

I believe that teaching still offers one of the best professions for the stop-in, stop-out needs of women in childbearing ages. With a career ladder in effect to allow the resumption of professional duties at a high level, I believe that more talented and creative women will be reattracted to teaching.

3. States need to reconceptualize what teaching and teacher education is all about.

There exists a corpus of research which shows the importance of the years from birth to five on the subsequent intellectual growth of children. This developmental stage is referred to as pre-kindergarten years and these years are seen to be extremely important in the development of the child but there is very little talk of capitalizing on this. Virtually all of the reports emanating from governmental and nongovernmental agencies have made recommendations almost exclusively dealing with secondary schools. Such recommendations are necessary but are not sufficient to improve our education system. It is my contention that if we as a nation pay attention to the pre-kindergarten years we will be dealing with an investment that will reap great dividends later on. This is an extension of my "value added" comments stated above. The better prepared the children are as they enter elementary school, the better they will be as they enter middle school, high school and college.

The fact is, that the first teachers children have are their parents. They are noncertified and they are not educated as teachers. When working with their children they follow their intuition: sometimes they are right and sometimes they are wrong in what they do.

The major reconceptualization necessary to improve education in this nation is to acknowledge the importance of pre-kindergarten education delivered by parents and teachers. We must develop education and training for both parents and teachers so they may do an effective job with these children, and we must fund and implement such programs. When such a reconceptualization occurs and we as a nation think of education as a "womb to tomb" endeavor and recognize the extreme importance of education in the early years, I believe that the effect of this will be a better educational system at all levels.